Stochastic Gradient Twin Support Vector Machine for Large Scale Problems

Zhen Wang, Yuan-Hai Shao, Lan Bai, Li-Ming Liu, and Nai-Yang Deng

Abstract—For classification problems, twin support vector machine (TSVM) with nonparallel hyperplanes has been shown to be more powerful than support vector machine (SVM). However, it is time consuming and insufficient memory to deal with large scale problems due to calculating the inverse of matrices. In this paper, we propose an efficient stochastic gradient twin support vector machine (SGTSVM) based on stochastic gradient descent algorithm (SGD). As far as now, it is the first time that SGD is applied to TSVM though there have been some variants where SGD was applied to SVM (SGSVM). Compared with SGSVM, our SGTSVM is more stable, and its convergence is also proved. In addition, its simple nonlinear version is also presented. Experimental results on several benchmark and large scale datasets have shown that the performance of our SGTSVM is comparable to the current classifiers with a very fast learning speed.

Index Terms—Classification, support vector machine, twin support vector machine, stochastic gradient descent.

arXiv:1704.05596v1 [cs.LG] 19 Apr 2017

1 Introduction

Support vector machine (SVM), being powerful tool for classification [1], [2], [3], has already outperformed most other classifiers in a wide variety of applications [4], [5], [6]. Different from SVM with a pair of parallel hyperplanes, twin support vector machine (TSVM) [7] with a pair of nonparallel hyperplanes has been proposed and developed, e.g., twin bounded support vector machine (TBSVM) [8], twin parametric margin support vector machine (TPMSVM) [9], and weighted Lagrangian twin support vector machine (WLTSVM) [10]. These classifiers have been widely applied in many practical problems [11], [12], [13], [14], [15]. In the training stage, SVM solves a quadratic programming problem (QPP), whereas TSVM solve two smaller QPPs by traditional solver such as interior method [2], [16], [7]. However, neither SVM nor TSVM based on these solvers can deal with the large scale problems, especially millions of samples.

In order to deal with the large scale problems, many improvements were proposed, e.g., for SVM, sequential minimal optimization, coordinate decent method, and trust region Newton in [17], [18], [19], [20], and for TSVM, successive overrelaxation technique, Newton-Armijo algorithm, and dual coordinate decent method in [8], [12], [21]. The stochastic gradient descent algorithm for SVM (SGSVM, PEGASOS) [22], [23], [24], [25] attracts a great attention, because it partitions the large scale problem into a series of subproblems by stochastic sampling with a suitable size. It has been proved that SGSVM is almost sure convergent, and thus is able to find an approximation of the desired solution with high probability [26], [23], [24]. The experiments confirm the effectiveness of these algorithms with an amazing learning speed.

However, for large scale problems, the sampling in SGD may bring some difficulties to SVM due to only a small subset of the dataset is selected for training. In fact, if the subset is not suitable, SGSVM would be weak. It is well known that in SVM the support vectors (SVs), a small subset of the dataset, decides the final classifier. If the stochastic sampling does not include the SVs sufficiently, the classifier would lose some generalizations. Figure 1 is a toy example for SGSVM. There are two classes in this figure, where the positive and the negative class respectively include 6 and 4 samples, where the circle is one of the potential SVs. The solid blue line is the separating line obtained by SGSVM with three different sampling: (i) strengthening the circle sample; (ii) infrequently using the circle sample; (iii) ignoring the circle sample. Figure 1 shows that the circle sample plays an important role, and infrequently using or ignoring this sample would lead to misclassify.

Compared with SVM, it is significant that TSVM is more stable for sampling and does not strongly depend on some special samples such as the SVs [7], [8], which indicates SGD is more suitable for TSVM. Therefore, in this paper, we propose a stochastic gradient twin support vector machine (SGTSVM). Different from SGSVM, our method selects two samples from different classes randomly in each iteration to construct a pair of nonparallel hyperplanes. Due to TSVM fits all of the training samples, our method is stable for the stochastic sampling and thus gains well generalizations. Moreover, the characteristics inherited from TSVM result in that our SGTSVM suits many cases, e.g., "cross plane" dataset [27] and preferential classification [7]. As the toy example, Figure 2 shows the corresponding results by SGTSVM. Comparing Figure 1 and Figure 2, it is clear that

- *Zhen Wang is with School of Mathematical Sciences, Inner Mongolia University, Hohhot, 010021, P.R.China, e-mail: wangzhen@imu.edu.cn.*
- *Yuan-Hai Shao is with the Zhijiang College, Zhejiang University of Technology, Hangzhou, 310024, P.R.China, e-mail: shaoyuanhai21@163.com.*
- *Lan Bai is with School of Mathematical Sciences, Inner Mongolia University, Hohhot, 010021, P.R.China e-mail: bailanhaomei@163.com.*
- *Li-Ming Liu is with the School of Statistics, Capital University of Economics and Business, Beijing, 100070, P.R.China, e-mail: llm5609@163.com*
- *Nai-Yang Deng is with the College of Science, China Agricultural University, Beijing, 100083, P.R.China, e-mail: dengnaiyang@cau.edu.cn.*



Fig. 1. SGSVM on 10 samples from two classes. (i) Training includes all of the 10 samples with 11 iterations, and the circle sample is used twice; (ii) Training includes all of the 10 samples with 28 iterations, and the circle sample is used once; (iii) Training includes 9 samples with 27 iterations, where the circle sample is excluded.



Fig. 2. SGTSVM on 10 samples from two classes. (i) Training includes all of the 10 samples with 7 iterations, and the circle sample is used twice; (ii) Training includes all of the 10 samples with 16 iterations, and the circle sample is used once; (iii) Training includes 9 samples with 15 iterations, where the circle sample is excluded.

SGTSVM performs better than SGSVM.

The main contributions of this paper includes:

(i) a SGD-based TSVM (SGTSVM) is first proposed, and it is very easy to be extended to other TSVM-type classifiers;

(ii) we prove that the proposed SGTSVM is convergent, instead of almost sure convergence in SGSVM;

(iii) for the uniformly sampling, it is proved that the original objective of the solution to SGTSVM is bounded by the optimum of TBSVM, which indicates the solution to SGTSVM is an approximation of the optimal solution to TBSVM, while SGSVM only has an opportunity to obtain an approximation of the optimal solution to SVM (see Corollaries 1 and 2 in [24]);

(iv) the nonlinear case of SGTSVM is obtained directly based on its original problem, whereas the nonlinear case of SGSVM is derived from SVM's dual problem;

(v) each iteration of SGTSVM includes no more than $8n + 4$ multiplications without additional storage, so it is the fastest one than other proposed TSVM-type classifiers.

The rest of this paper is organized as follow. Section 2 briefly reviews SVM, SGSVM, and TBSVM. Our linear and nonlinear SGTSVMs together with the theoretical analysis are elaborated in Section 3. Experiments are arranged in Section 4. Finally, we give the conclusions.

2 Related Works

Consider a binary classification problem in the n-dimensional real space R^n. The set of training samples is represented by $X \in R^{n\times m}$, where $x \in R^n$ is the sample with the label $y \in \{+1, -1\}$. We further organize the m_1 samples of Class $+1$ into a matrix $X_1 \in R^{n\times m_1}$ and the m_2 samples of Class -1 into a matrix $X_2 \in R^{n\times m_2}$. Below, we give a brief outlines some related works.

2.1 CSVM

C-support vector machine (CSVM) [28], one formulation of the standard SVM, searches for a separating hyperplane

$$w^\top x + b = 0, \tag{1}$$

where $w \in R^n$ and $b \in R$. By introducing the regularization term, the primal problem of CSVM can be expressed as a quadratic programming problem (QPP) as follow

$$\begin{array}{ll} \min\limits_{w,b} & \frac{1}{2}||w||^2 + \frac{c}{m}e^\top \xi \\ \text{s.t.} & D(X^\top w + b) \geq e - \xi, \;\; \xi \geq 0, \end{array} \tag{2}$$

where $||\cdot||$ denotes the L_2 norm, $c > 0$ is a parameter with some quantitative meanings [28], e is a vector of ones with an appropriate dimension, $\xi \in R^m$ is the slack vector, and $D = \text{diag}(y_1, \ldots, y_m)$. Note that the minimization of the regularization term $\frac{1}{2}\|w\|^2$ is equivalent to maximize the margin between two parallel supporting hyperplanes $w^\top x + b = \pm 1$. And the structural risk minimization principle is implemented in this problem [1].

2.2 SGSVM

SGSVM (or PEGASOS as an alias) [23], [24] considers a strongly convex problem by modifying (2) as follow

$$\begin{array}{ll}\min\limits_{w} & \frac{1}{2}||w||^2+\frac{c}{m}e^\top\xi \\ s.t. & DX^\top w\geq e-\xi,\xi\geq 0,\end{array} \tag{3}$$

and recasts the above problem to

$$\min_{w}\ \frac{1}{2}||w||^2+\frac{c}{m}e^\top(e-DX^\top w)_+, \tag{4}$$

where $(\cdot)_+$ replaces negative components of a vector by zeros.

In the tth iteration ($t\geq 1$), SGSVM constructs a temporary function, which is defined by a random sample $x_t\in X$ as

$$g_t(w)=\frac{1}{2}||w||^2+c(1-y_tw^\top x_t)_+. \tag{5}$$

Then, starting with an initial w_1, SGSVM iteratively updates $w_{t+1}=w_t-\eta_t\nabla_t$ for $t\geq 1$, where $\eta_t=1/t$ is the step size and ∇_t is the sub-gradient of $g_t(w)$ at w_t,

$$\nabla_t=w_t-cy_tx_t\text{sign}(1-y_tw_t^\top x_t)_+. \tag{6}$$

After a predetermined T iterations, the last w_{T+1} is outputted as w. And a new sample x can be predicted by

$$y=\text{sign}(w^\top x). \tag{7}$$

It has been proved that the average solution $\bar{w}=\frac{1}{T}\sum\limits_{t=1}^{T}w_t$ is bounded by the optimal solution w^* to (4) with $o(1)$, and thus SGSVM has with a probability of at least $1/2$ to find a good approximation of w^* [24]. The authors of [24] also pointed out that w_T is often used instead of $\bar{w}$ in practice. The sample x_t which is selected randomly can be replaced with a small subset belonging to the whole dataset, and the subset only including a sample is often used in practice [23], [24], [25]. In order to extend the generalization ability of SGSVM, the bias term b in CSVM can be appended to SGSVM by replacing $g(w_t)$ of (5) with

$$g(w_t,b)=\frac{1}{2}||w_t||^2+C(1-y_t(w_t^\top x_t+b))_+. \tag{8}$$

However, this modification would lead to the function not to be strongly convex and thus yield a slow convergence rate [24].

2.3 TBSVM

TBSVM [8], a representative of TSVM, seeks a pair of nonparallel hyperplanes in R^n which can be expressed as

$$w_1^\top x+b_1=0\ \text{ and }\ w_2^\top x+b_2=0, \tag{9}$$

such that each hyperplane is close to samples of one class and has a certain distance from the other class. To find the pair of nonparallel hyperplanes, it is required to get the solutions to the primal problems

$$\begin{array}{ll}\min\limits_{w_1,b_1} & \frac{1}{2}(||w_1||^2+b_1^2)+\frac{c_1}{2m_1}\|X_1^\top w_1+b_1\|^2+\frac{c_2}{m_2}e^\top\xi_1, \\ \text{s.t.} & X_2^\top w_1+b_1-\xi_1\leq -e,\ \ \xi_1\geq 0,\end{array} \tag{10}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{ll}\min\limits_{w_2,b_2} & \frac{1}{2}(||w_2||^2+b_2^2)+\frac{c_3}{2m_2}\|X_2^\top w_2+b_2\|^2+\frac{c_4}{m_1}e^\top\xi_2, \\ \text{s.t.} & X_1^\top w_2+b_2+\xi_2\geq e,\ \ \xi_2\geq 0,\end{array} \tag{11}$$

where c_1, c_2, c_3, and c_4 are positive parameters, $\xi_1\in R^{m_2}$ and $\xi_2\in R^{m_1}$ are slack vectors. Their geometric meaning is clear. For example, for (10), its objective function makes the samples of the first class proximal to the hyperplane $w_1^\top x+b_1=0$ together with the regularization term, while the constraints make each sample of the second class has a distance more than $1/||w_1||$ away from the hyperplane $w_1^\top x+b_1=-1$.

Once the solutions (w_1,b_1) and (w_2,b_2) to the problems (10) and (11) are respectively obtained, a new point $x\in R^n$ is assigned to which class depends on the distance to the two hyperplanes in (9), i.e.,

$$y=\arg\min_{i}\ \ \frac{|w_i^\top x+b_i|}{\|w_i\|}, \tag{12}$$

where $|\cdot|$ is the absolute value.

3 SGTSVM

In this section, we elaborate our SGTSVM with its nonlinear formation, and give its convergence analysis together with the boundedness.

3.1 Linear Formation

Following the notations in Section 2, we recast the QPPs (10) and (11) to unconstrained problems

$$\begin{array}{l}\min\limits_{w_1,b_1}\ \frac{1}{2}(||w_1||^2+b_1^2)+\frac{c_1}{2m_1}||X_1^\top w_1+b_1||^2 \\ \quad+\frac{c_2}{m_2}e^\top(e+X_2^\top w_1+b_1)_+,\end{array} \tag{13}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{l}\min\limits_{w_2,b_2}\ \frac{1}{2}(||w_2||^2+b_2^2)+\frac{c_3}{2m_2}||X_2^\top w_2+b_2||^2 \\ +\frac{c_4}{m_1}e^\top(e-X_1^\top w_2-b_2)_+,\end{array} \tag{14}$$

respectively.

In order to solve the above two problems, we construct a series of strictly convex functions $f_{1,t}(w_1,b_1)$ and $f_{2,t}(w_2,b_2)$ with $t\geq 1$ as

$$\begin{array}{l}f_{1,t}=\frac{1}{2}(||w_1||^2+b_1^2)+\frac{c_1}{2}||w_1^\top x_t+b_1||^2 \\ \quad+c_2(1+w_1^\top\hat{x}_t+b_1)_+,\end{array} \tag{15}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{l}f_{2,t}=\frac{1}{2}(||w_2||^2+b_2^2)+\frac{c_3}{2}||w_2^\top\hat{x}_t+b_2||^2 \\ \quad+c_4(1-w_2^\top x_t-b_2)_+,\end{array} \tag{16}$$

where x_t and $\hat{x}_t$ are selected randomly from X_1 and X_2, respectively.

The sub-gradients of the above functions at $(w_{1,t},b_{1,t})$ and $(w_{2,t},b_{2,t})$ can be obtained as

$$\begin{array}{l}\nabla_{w_{1,t}}f_{1,t}=w_{1,t}+c_1(w_{1,t}^\top x_t+b_{1,t})x_t \\ +c_2\hat{x}_t\text{sign}(1+w_{1,t}^\top\hat{x}_t+b_{1,t})_+, \\ \nabla_{b_{1,t}}f_{1,t}=b_{1,t}+c_1(w_{1,t}^\top x_t+b_{1,t}) \\ +c_2\text{sign}(1+w_{1,t}^\top\hat{x}_t+b_{1,t})_+,\end{array} \tag{17}$$

and

$$\begin{array}{l}\nabla_{w_{2,t}}f_{2,t}=w_{2,t}+c_3(w_{2,t}^\top\hat{x}_t+b_{2,t})\hat{x}_t \\ -c_4x_t\text{sign}(1-w_{2,t}^\top x_t-b_{2,t})_+, \\ \nabla_{b_{2,t}}f_{2,t}=b_{2,t}+c_3(w_{2,t}^\top\hat{x}_t+b_{2,t}) \\ -c_4\text{sign}(1-w_{2,t}^\top x_t-b_{1,t})_+,\end{array} \tag{18}$$

respectively.

Our SGTSVM starts from the initial $(w_{1,1}, b_{1,1})$ and $(w_{2,t}, b_{2,t})$. Then, for $t \geq 1$, the updates are given by

$$\begin{aligned} w_{1,t+1} &= w_{1,t} - \eta_t \nabla_{w_{1,t}} f_{1,t}, \\ b_{1,t+1} &= b_{1,t} - \eta_t \nabla_{b_{1,t}} f_{1,t}, \\ w_{2,t+1} &= w_{2,t} - \eta_t \nabla_{w_{2,t}} f_{2,t}, \\ b_{2,t+1} &= b_{2,t} - \eta_t \nabla_{b_{2,t}} f_{2,t}, \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

where η_t is the step size and typically is set to $1/t$. If the terminated condition is satisfied, $(w_1, b_1) = (w_{1,t}, b_{1,t})$ and $(w_2, b_2) = (w_{2,t}, b_{2,t})$. Then, a new sample $x \in R^n$ can be predicted the same as TBSVM.

The above procedures can be summarized as follows

Algorithm 1 SGTSVM Framework.

Input:

Given the training dataset $X_1 \in R^{n \times m_1}$ as positive class, $X_2 \in R^{n \times m_2}$ as negative class, select parameters c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4, and a small tolerance tol, typically $tol = 1e-4$.

Output:

w_1, b_1, w_2, b_2.

1: set $w_{1,1}$, $b_{1,1}$, $w_{2,1}$, and $b_{2,1}$ be zeros;
For $t = 1, 2, \ldots$
2: Choose a pair of samples x_t and $\hat{x}_t$ from X_1 and X_2 at random, respectively;
3: Compute the tth gradients by (17) and (18);
4: Update $w_{1,t+1}$, $b_{1,t+1}$, $w_{2,t+1}$, and $b_{2,t+1}$ by (19);
5: If $||w_{1,t+1} - w_{1,t}|| + |b_{1,t+1} - b_{1,t}| < tol$, stop updating $w_{1,t+1}$ and $b_{1,t+1}$. Let $w_1 = w_{1,t+1}$, $b_1 = b_{1,t+1}$;
6: If $||w_{2,t+1} - w_{2,t}|| + |b_{2,t+1} - b_{2,t}| < tol$, stop updating $w_{2,t+1}$ and $b_{2,t+1}$. Let $w_2 = w_{2,t+1}$, $b_2 = b_{2,t+1}$;

3.2 Nonlinear Formation

Now, we extend our SGTSVM to nonlinear case by the kernel trick [27], [7], [8], [29], [30]. Suppose $K(\cdot, \cdot)$ is the predefined kernel function, then the nonparallel hyperplanes can be expressed as

$$K(x, X)w_1 + b_1 = 0 \ \text{ and } \ K(x, X)w_2 + b_2 = 0. \tag{20}$$

The counterparts of (13) and (14) can be formulated as

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{w_1, b_1} \ & \tfrac{1}{2}(||w_1||^2 + b_1^2) + \tfrac{c_1}{2m_1}||K(X_1, X)w_1 + b_1||^2 \\ & + \tfrac{c_2}{m_2} e^\top (e + K(X_2, X)w_1 + b_1)_+, \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \min_{w_2, b_2} \ & \tfrac{1}{2}(||w_2||^2 + b_2^2) + \tfrac{c_3}{2m_2}||K(X_2, X)w_2 + b_2||^2 \\ & + \tfrac{c_4}{m_1} e^\top (e - K(X_1, X)w_2 - b_2)_+. \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

Then, we construct a series of functions with $t \geq 1$ as

$$\begin{aligned} h_{1,t} = \ & \tfrac{1}{2}(||w_1||^2 + b_1^2) + \tfrac{c_1}{2}||K(x_t, X)w_1 + b_1||^2 \\ & + c_2(1 + K(\hat{x}_t, X)w_1 + b_1)_+, \end{aligned} \tag{23}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} h_{2,t} = \ & \tfrac{1}{2}(||w_2||^2 + b_2^2) + \tfrac{c_3}{2}||K(\hat{x}_t, X)w_2 + b_2||^2 \\ & + c_4(1 - K(x_t, X)w_2 - b_2)_+. \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

Similar to (17), (18), and (19), the sub-gradients and updates can be obtained. The details are omitted.

For large scaled problems, it is time consuming to calculate the kernel $K(\cdot, X)$. However, the reduced kernel strategy, which has been successfully applied for SVM and TSVM [31], [32], [12], can also be applied for our SGTSVM. The reduced kernel strategy replaces $K(\cdot, X)$ with $K(\cdot, \tilde{X})$, where $\tilde{X}$ is a random sampled subset of X. In practice, $\tilde{X}$ just needs $1\% - 10\%$ samples from X to get a well performance, reducing the learning time without loss of generalization [32].

3.3 Analysis

In this subsection, we discuss two issues: (i) the convergence of the solution in SGTSVM; (ii) the relation between the solution in SGTSVM and the optimal one in TBSVM. For convenience, we just consider the first QPP of linear TBSVM together with its SGD formation. The conclusions on another QPP and the nonlinear formations can be obtained easily the same as the first one.

Let $u = (w^\top, b)^\top$, $Z_1 = (X_1^\top, e)^\top$, $Z_2 = (X_2^\top, e)^\top$, $z = (x^\top, 1)^\top$, and the notations with the subscripts in SGTSVM also comply with this definition. Then, the first QPP (13) is reformulated as

$$\min_u \ f(u) = \tfrac{1}{2}||u||^2 + \tfrac{c_1}{2m_1}||Z_1 u||^2 + \tfrac{c_2}{m_2} e^\top (e + Z_2 u)_+. \tag{25}$$

Next, we reformulate the tth ($t \geq 1$) function in SGTSVM as

$$f_t(u) = \tfrac{1}{2}||u||^2 + \tfrac{c_1}{2}||u^\top z_t||^2 + c_2(1 + u^\top \hat{z}_t)_+, \tag{26}$$

where z_t and $\hat{z}_t$ are the samples selected randomly from Z_1 and Z_2 for the tth iteration, respectively. The sub-gradient of $f_t(u)$ at u_t is denoted as

$$\nabla_t = u_t + c_1(u^\top z_t)z_t + c_2 \hat{z}_t \text{sign}(1 + u^\top \hat{z}_t)_+. \tag{27}$$

Given u_1 and the step size $\eta_t = 1/t$, u_{t+1} with $t \geq 1$ is updated by

$$u_{t+1} = u_t - \eta_t \nabla_t, \tag{28}$$

i.e.,

$$u_{t+1} = (1 - \tfrac{1}{t})u_t - \tfrac{c_1}{t} z_t z_t^\top u_t - \tfrac{c_2}{t} \hat{z}_t \text{sign}(1 + u_t^\top \hat{z}_t)_+. \tag{29}$$

Lemma 3.1. For all $t \geq 1$, $||\nabla_t||$ and $||u_t||$ have the upper bounds.

Proof. The formation (29) can be rewritten as

$$u_{t+1} = A_t u_t + \tfrac{1}{t} v_t, \tag{30}$$

where $A_t = \frac{1}{t}((t-1)I - c_1 z_t z_t^\top)$, I is the identity matrix, and $v_t = -c_2 \hat{z}_t \text{sign}(1 + u_t^\top \hat{z}_t)_+$. Note that for sufficient t, there is a positive integer N such that for $t > N$, A_t is positive definite, and the largest eigenvalue λ_t of A_t is smaller than or equal to $\frac{t-1}{t}$. Based on (30), we have

$$u_{t+1} = \prod_{i=N+1}^{t} A_{t+N+1-i} u_{N+1} + \sum_{i=N+1}^{t} \tfrac{1}{i} \Big(\prod_{j=i+1}^{t} A_{t+i+1-j} \Big) v_i. \tag{31}$$

For $i \geq N+1$, $||A_{t+N+1-i} u_{N+1}|| \leq \lambda_i ||u_{N+1}|| \leq \frac{i-1}{i}||u_{N+1}||$ [33]. Therefore,

$$|| \prod_{i=N+1}^{t} A_{t+N+1-i} u_{N+1}|| \leq \tfrac{N}{t}||u_{N+1}||, \tag{32}$$

and

$$||\tfrac{1}{i}(\prod_{j=i+1}^{t} A_{t+i+1-j})v_i|| \leq \tfrac{1}{t}\max_{i\leq t}||v_i||. \quad (33)$$

Thus, we have

$$\begin{aligned} ||u_{t+1}|| &\leq \tfrac{N}{t}||u_{N+1}|| + \tfrac{t-N}{t}\max_{i\leq t}||v_i|| \\ &\leq ||u_{N+1}|| + c_2 \max_{z\in Z_2}||z||. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Let M be the largest norm of the samples in the dataset and $G_1 = \max\{\max\{||u_1||, \ldots, ||u_N||\}, ||u_{N+1}|| + c_2 M\}$. This leads to that G_1 is an upper bound of $||u_t||$, and $G_2 = G_1 + c_1 G_1 M^2 + c_2 M$ is an upper bound of $||\nabla_t||$, for $t \geq 1$. □

Theorem 3.1. The iterative formation (29) of our SGTSVM is convergent.

Proof. On the one hand, from (32) in the proof of Lemma 3.1, we have

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} ||\prod_{i=N+1}^{t} A_{t+N+1-i}u_{N+1}|| = 0, \quad (35)$$

which indicates

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \prod_{i=N+1}^{t} A_{t+N+1-i}u_{N+1} = 0. \quad (36)$$

On the other hand, from (33), we have

$$\sum_{i=N+1}^{t} ||\tfrac{1}{i}(\prod_{j=i+1}^{t} A_{t+i+1-j})v_i|| \leq M, \quad (37)$$

which indicates that the following limit exists

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \sum_{i=N+1}^{t} ||\tfrac{1}{i}(\prod_{j=i+1}^{t} A_{t+i+1-j})v_i|| < \infty. \quad (38)$$

Note that an infinite series of vectors is convergent if its norm series is convergent [34]. Therefore, the following limit exists

$$\lim_{t\to\infty} \sum_{i=N+1}^{t} \tfrac{1}{i}(\prod_{j=i+1}^{t} A_{t+i+1-j})v_i < \infty. \quad (39)$$

Combine (36) with (39), we conclude that the series w_{t+1} is convergent for $t \to \infty$. □

Based on the above theorem, it is reasonable to take the terminate condition to be $||u_{t+1} - u_t|| < tol$. Moreover, if we reform (31) by u_1, then

$$u_{t+1} = \prod_{i=1}^{t} A_{t+1-i}u_1 + \sum_{i=1}^{t} \tfrac{1}{i}(\prod_{j=i+1}^{t} A_{t+i+1-j})v_i. \quad (40)$$

In order to keep u_{t+1} to be convergent fast, it is suggested to set $u_1 = 0$.

In the following, we analyse the relation between the solution u_t in SGTSVM and the optimal solution $u^* = (w^{*\top}, b^*)^\top$ in TBSVM.

Lemma 3.2. Let $f_1, \ldots, f_T$ be a sequence of convex functions, and $u_1, \ldots, u_{T+1} \in R^n$ be a sequence of vectors. For $t \geq 1$, $u_{t+1} = u_t - \eta_t \nabla_t$, where ∇_t belongs to the sub-gradient set of f_t at u_t and $\eta_t = 1/t$. Suppose $||u_t||$ and $||\nabla_t||$ have the upper bounds G_1 and G_2, respectively. Then, for all $\theta \in R^n$, we have

(i) $\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} f_t(u_t) \leq \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} f_t(\theta) + G_2(G_1 + ||\theta||) + \frac{1}{2T}G_2^2(1 + \ln T)$;

(ii) for sufficiently large T, given any $\varepsilon > 0$, then $\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} f_t(u_t) \leq \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} f_t(\theta) + \varepsilon$.

Proof. Since f_t is convex and ∇_t is the sub-gradient of f_t at u_t, we have that

$$f_t(u_t) - f_t(\theta) \leq (u_t - \theta)^\top \nabla_t. \quad (41)$$

Note that

$$(u_t - \theta)^\top \nabla_t = \tfrac{1}{2\eta_t}(||u_t - \theta||^2 - ||u_{t+1} - \theta||^2) + \tfrac{\eta_t}{2}||\nabla_t||^2. \quad (42)$$

Combine (41) and (42), we have

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{t=1}^{T}(f_t(u_t) - f_t(\theta)) \\ \leq\ & \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{t=1}^{T}\tfrac{1}{\eta_t}(||u_t - \theta||^2 - ||u_{t+1} - \theta||^2) + \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(\eta_t||\nabla_t||^2) \\ =\ & \tfrac{1}{2}(\textstyle\sum_{t=1}^{T}||u_t - \theta||^2 - T||u_{T+1} - \theta||^2) + \tfrac{1}{2}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(\eta_t||\nabla_t||^2) \\ \leq\ & (G_1 + ||\theta||)\sum_{t=1}^{T}||u_{T+1} - u_t|| + \tfrac{1}{2}G_2^2(1 + \ln T) \\ =\ & (G_1 + ||\theta||)\sum_{t=1}^{T}||\sum_{i=t}^{T}\tfrac{1}{i}\nabla_i|| + \tfrac{1}{2}G_2^2(1 + \ln T) \\ \leq\ & TG_2(G_1 + ||\theta||) + \tfrac{1}{2}G_2^2(1 + \ln T) \end{aligned} \quad (43)$$

Multiplying (43) by $1/T$ leads to the conclusion (i).

On the other hand, suppose $\lim_{T\to\infty} u_T = \tilde{u}$, we have $\lim_{T\to\infty}||u_T|| = ||\tilde{u}||$. Then, $\lim_{T\to\infty}\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}||u_t - \theta|| = \lim_{T\to\infty}||u_T - \theta|| = ||\tilde{u} - \theta||$. Note that $\lim_{T\to\infty}\frac{G_2^2(1+lnT)}{T} = 0$. Given any $\varepsilon > 0$, for sufficiently large T,

$$\begin{aligned} &\tfrac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(f_t(u_t) - f_t(\theta)) \\ \leq\ & \tfrac{1}{2}(\tfrac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}||u_t - \theta||^2 - ||u_{T+1} - \theta||^2) + \tfrac{1}{2T}G_2^2(1 + lnT) \\ \leq\ & \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon + \tfrac{1}{2}\varepsilon = \varepsilon. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

□

We are now ready to bound the average instantaneous objective (26).

Theorem 3.2. For f_t $(t = 1, \ldots, T)$ defined as (26) in SGTSVM, u_t $(t = 1, \ldots, T)$ is constructed by (29), and u^* is the optimal solution to (25). Then,

(i) there are two constants G_1 and G_2 (actually, they are the upper bounds of $||w_t||$ and $||\nabla_t||$, respectively) such that $\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} f_t(u_t) \leq \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} f_t(u^*) + G_2(G_1 + ||u^*||) + \frac{1}{2T}G_2^2(1 + \ln T)$;

(ii) for sufficiently large T, given any $\varepsilon > 0$, then $\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} f_t(u_t) \leq \frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} f_t(u^*) + \varepsilon$.

Proof. Obviously, f_t $(t = 1, \ldots, T)$ is convex. Let G_1 and G_2 respectively be the upper bounds of $||u_t||$ and $||\nabla_t||$, the conclusions come from Lemmas 3.1 and 3.2. □

In the following, let us discuss the relation between the solutions to SGTSVM and TBSVM with the uniform sampling.

Corollary 3.1. Assume the conditions stated in Theorem 3.1 and $m_1 = m_2$, where m_1 and m_2 are the sample number of X_1 and X_2, respectively. Suppose $T = km_1$, where $k > 0$ is an integer, and each sample is selected k times at random. Then

(i) $f(u_T) \leq f(u^*)+G_2(G_1+||u^*||+G_2)+\frac{1}{2T}G_1^2(1+\ln T)$;

(ii) for sufficiently large T, given any $\varepsilon > 0$, then $f(u_T) \leq f(u^*) + G_2^2 + \varepsilon$.

Proof. First, we prove that for all $i, j = 1, 2, \ldots, T$,

$$|f_t(u_i) - f_t(u_j)| \leq G_2||u_i - u_j||, \;\; t = 1, 2, \ldots, T. \quad (45)$$

From the formation of $f_t(u)$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |f_t(u_i) - f_t(u_j)| \;\; &\leq \tfrac{1}{2}|||u_i||^2 - ||u_j||^2| \\ &+\tfrac{c_1}{2}|(u_i^\top z_t)^2 - (u_j^\top z_t)^2| \\ &+c_2|(1 + u_i^\top \hat{z}_t)_+ - (1 + u_j^\top \hat{z}_t)_+|. \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Since G_1 is the upper bound of $||u_t||$ ($t \geq 1$) and M is the largest norm of the samples in the dataset, the first part, the second part, and the third part on the right hand of (46) are respectively

$$\tfrac{1}{2}|||u_i||^2 - ||u_j||^2| \leq G_1||u_i - u_j||, \quad (47)$$

$$\begin{aligned} & \tfrac{c_1}{2}|(u_i^\top z_t)^2 - (u_j^\top z_t)^2| \\ = \;\; & \tfrac{c_1}{2}|(u_i + u_j)^\top z_t(u_i - u_j)^\top z_t| \\ \leq \;\; & c_1 G_1 M^2||u_i - u_j||, \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} & c_2|(1 + u_i^\top \hat{z}_t)_+ - (1 + u_j^\top \hat{z}_t)_+| \\ = \;\; & c_2|(u_i - u_j)^\top \hat{z}_t| \\ \leq \;\; & c_2 M||u_i - u_j||. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Therefore, there is a constant $G_2 = G_1 + c_1 G_1 M^2 + c_2 M$ satisfying (45).

From $u_{t+1} = u_t - \frac{1}{t}\nabla_t$, it is easy to obtain

$$u_{t+1} = u_1 - \sum_{i=1}^{t} \tfrac{1}{i}\nabla_t, \;\; t = 1, 2, \ldots, T. \quad (50)$$

Thus, for $1 \leq i < j \leq T$,

$$||u_i - u_j|| = ||\sum_{t=i}^{j-1} \tfrac{1}{t}\nabla_t|| \leq \sum_{t=i}^{j-1} \tfrac{1}{t}G_2. \quad (51)$$

Since $T = km_1 = km_2$, for all $u \in R^n$, $\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} f_t(u) = f(u)$. Note that $f(u)$ is the objective of TBSVM. Based on (45) and (51), we have

$$\begin{aligned} & f(u_T) - \tfrac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} f_t(u_t) \\ = \;\; & \tfrac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T}(f_t(u_T) - f_t(u_t)) \\ \leq \;\; & \tfrac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} G_2||u_T - u_t|| \\ \leq \;\; & \tfrac{G_2^2(T-1)}{T} \\ \leq \;\; & G_2^2. \end{aligned} \quad (52)$$

Using the Theorem 3.1, we have the conclusion immediately. □

If $m_1 \neq m_2$, we can modify the sampling rule to obtain the same result as one in Corollary 3.1.

TABLE 1
Details of the benchmark datasets.

Data	Sample	Feature	Class +1	Class -1
Australian	690	14	307	383
CMC	1,473	9	1140	333
Creadit	690	15	307	383
Diabetics	768	8	268	500
German	1,000	20	700	300
Hypothyroid	3,163	25	151	3012
Pimaindian	768	8	268	500
Ring	7,400	20	3736	3664
TIC	5,822	85	348	5474
Titanic	2,201	3	711	1490
Two	7,400	20	3697	3703

Corollary 3.2. Assume the conditions stated in Corollary 3.1, but $m_1 \neq m_2$. Suppose $T = kd(m_1, m_2)$, where $k > 0$ is an integer and d is the least common multiple of m_1 and m_2. The sample in X_1 is selected kd/m_1 times at random, and the one in X_2 is kd/m_2 times at random. Then

(i) $f(u_T) \leq f(u^*)+G_2(G_1+||u^*||+G_2)+\frac{1}{2T}G_1^2(1+\ln T)$;

(ii) for sufficiently large T, given any $\varepsilon > 0$, then $f(u_T) \leq f(u^*) + G_2^2 + \varepsilon$.

Note that for all $u \in R^n$, $\frac{1}{T}\sum_{t=1}^{T} f_t(u) = f(u)$. The proof of the above corollary is the same as Corollary 3.1.

The above corollaries provide the approximations of u^* by u_T. If the sampling rule is not as stated in these corollaries, these upper bounds no longer holds. However, Kakade and Tewari [35] have shown a way to obtain a similar bounds with high probability.

4 Experiments

In the experiments, we compared our SGTSVM with CSVM [1], LSSVM [36], SGSVM [24], TBSVM [8], and WLTSVM [10] on several artifical and benchmark datasets. CSVM was implemented by Libsvm [19] based on SMO algorithm on small sample size datasets (i.e., $m \leq 10,000$), while Liblinear [20] was implemented for CSVM based on trust region algorithm on large scale datasets (i.e., $m > 10,000$). TBSVM was solved by SOR algorithm [8]. All of the methods were implemented on a PC with an Intel Core Duo processor (3.4 GHz) with 4 GB RAM, where LSSVM, SGSVM, WLTSVM, and SGTSVM were implemented by Matlab [37]. For practical convenience, the corresponding SGTSVM Matlab codes uploaded in http://www.optimal-group.org/Resource/SGTSVM.html.

4.1 Artificial datasets

We first test our SGTSVM compared with TBSVM on two artificial datasets [9], [27] in R^2 (see Figures **??** and **??**). The samples of two classes consist of uniform points are denoted as "+" and "×", respectively. Figures **??** and **??** show the learning results, in which the parameters were all fixed by 1, and the iteration in SGTSVM was 1000. It is obvious that both SGTSVM and TBSVM obtain well classification results, and SGTSVM performs a little better than TBSVM on the second dataset. Therefore, in Figures **??** and **??**, SGTSVM is effective as TBSVM.

4.2 Benchmark datasets

In order to analyze the convergent rate of our SGTSVM, it was tested on several small sample size datasets [38] (see Table 1) and its parameters c_1, c_2, c_3, and c_4 were selected from $\{2^i|i = -8, \ldots, 7\}$. For nonlinear case, Gaussian kernel $K(x_1, x_2) = \exp\{-\mu||x_1 - x_2||^2\}$ was used, and its parameter μ was selected from $\{2^i|i = -10, \ldots, 5\}$. For the optimal parameters, we depicted the iteration, accuracy (by ten-fold cross validation [39]), and learning time along with the parameter tol in Figures 3 and 4 for linear and nonlinear cases, respectively. From these figures, it is observed that: (i) SGTSVM terminates very fast for $tol \geq 1e-4$ but slow for $tol < 1e-4$; (ii) the converge rates of two problems in SGTSVM is generally different, but almost the same for $tol \geq 1e-4$; (iii) the accuracies are higher for smaller tol, but almost do not increase when $tol < 1e-5$; (iv) the learning time is very fast for large tol, but zooms when $tol < 1e-5$. Based on the above observations, tol in SGTSVM is suggested between $1e-5$ and $1e-4$. Anyone could set a smaller tol to obtain a higher accuracy together with more learning time.

Then, we compared SGTSVM with CSVM, LSSVM, SGSVM, TBSVM, and WLTSVM on these datasets. All of the regularization parameters c in CSVM, LSSVM and SGSVM, c_1, c_2, c_3, and c_4 in TBSVM, WLTSVM, and SGTSVM were selected from $\{2^i|i = -8, \ldots, 7\}$. The Gaussian kernel parameter μ was selected from $\{2^i|i = -10, \ldots, 5\}$. Table 2 shows the ten-fold cross validation accuracy and learning time by these classifiers for linear case, where the bold accuracy is the one that is much worse than others. It can be seen from the table that our SGTSVM has a similar accuracies as CSVM and LSSVM on these datasets, and their differences are no more than two percent. TBSVM obtains similar results as CSVM, LSSVM, and SGTSVM, though it cannot work on two datasets because of out of memory, where these datasets have more than five thousands samples. However, SGSVM and WLTSVM work worse than other classifiers, for SGSVM has a much lower accuracies than the highest classifier on four datasets and WLTSVM on three datasets (these results are bolded). It also can be seen from the table that LSSVM, SGSVM, WLTSVM, and SGTSVM learn a little faster than CSVM and much faster than TBSVM on the datasets that over one thousand samples. Table 3 shows the accuracy and learning time of these classifiers for nonlinear case. The conclusions about accuracy are similar as the linear case. In addition, the learning time of CSVM, LSSVM, TBSVM, and WLTSVM increases much more than the linear case except SGSVM and SGTSVM, indicating the SGD-based methods are stable on saving time.

4.3 Large scale datasets

To test the feasibility of these methods on large scale datasets, we ran them on three large scale datasets: "CODRNA", "SKIN", and "SUSY" [20]. Thereinto, CODRNA includes $59,535$ training samples and $271,618$ testing samples with 8 features, SKIN includes $245,057$ samples with 3 features, and SUSY includes $5,000,000$ samples with 18 features. We split SKIN and SUSY into two sets, where one set including 20% samples is used for training, and the other including 80% samples is used for testing. Due to the nonlinear cases spend too much time to learn on these datasets, we just considered the linear methods. Moreover, since LSSVM, TBSVM, and WLTSVM are out of memory on all of these datasets, the comparisons only include CSVM, SGSVM, and our SGTSVM, where CSVM is implemented by Liblinear [20]. The iteration of SGSVM is set to $10,000$. To speed up the learning rate of SGTSVM, we set $tol = 1e-3$ and add another paratactic terminate condition that the iteration is no more than $10,000$. Table 4 shows the ten-fold cross validation and testing accuracies, learning time, and required memory in training on these datasets. It is obvious that SGTSVM owns the highest accuracies on testing, and is as fast as SGSVM. In addition, our SGTSVM is much faster than CSVM with less memory. In detail, CSVM need store the entire training set in RAM, while SGSVM and SGTSVM only store a subset related to the iteration. Due to the required memory of CSVM increases with the size of dataset, it tends to out of memory with the increasing data size, while the same thing does not appear in SGSVM and SGTSVM, which indicates SGTSVM has a better generalization than CSVM.

5 Conclusion

The stochastic gradient twin support vector machine (SGTSVM) based on stochastic gradient decent algorithm (SGD) has been proposed. As our knowledge, it is the first time that SGD is introduced for TSVM-type classifiers. In addition, according to our experiments, our method is the fastest one among the TSVM-type classifiers on large scale datasets. By hiring the nonparallel hyperplanes, SGTSVM is more stable on sampling than SGSVM. In theory, SGTSVM is convergent, and is an approximation of TSVM with uniform sampling. Experimental results on several public available datasets have indicated that our SGTSVM has comparable accuracy compared with other TSVM-type classifiers, but with the fastest learning speed. For practical convenience, the corresponding SGTSVM Matlab codes can be downloaded from http://www.optimal-group.org/Resource/SGTSVM.html. For the future work, it is possible to design and study other SGD-based nonparallel hyperplanes SVM model.

Acknowledgments

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos. 11501310, 11201426, and 11371365), the Natural Science Foundation of Inner Mongolia Autonomous Region of China (No. 2015BS0606), and the Zhejiang Provincial Natural Science Foundation of China (No. LY15F030013).

References

[1] C. Cortes and V. Vapnik, "Support vector networks," *Machine Learning*, vol. 20, pp. 273–297, 1995.
[2] O. Mangasarian, *Nonlinear Programming*. SIAM, 1994.
[3] C. Zhang, Y. Tian, and N. Deng, "The new interpretation of support vector machines on statistical learning theory," *Science China*, vol. 53, no. 1, pp. 151–164, 2010.
[4] W. Noble, "Support vector machine applications in computational biology," in *Kernel Methods in Computational Biology*, Cambridge, 2004.



Fig. 3. The influences of parameter tol on iteration, accuracy, and learning time on the benchmark datasets for linear SGTSVM.

TABLE 2
The results on the benchmark datasets for linear case.

Data m×n	CSVM Time (Sec.)	LSSVM Time (Sec.)	SGSVM Time (Sec.)	TBSVM Time (Sec.)	WLTSVM Time (Sec.)	SGTSVM Time (Sec.)
Australian 690×14	85.33±0.22 0.0255	85.93±0.38 0.0002	86.75±0.35 0.0035	86.87±0.38 0.0126	86.75±0.43 0.0008	87.34±0.13 0.0042
CMC 1,473×9	77.39±0.00 0.0204	77.39±0.00 0.0002	**60.79**±0.21 0.0056	77.39±0.00 0.0541	**62.15**±0.36 0.0010	77.40±0.15 0.0118
Creadit 690×15	85.50±0.00 0.0452	85.78±0.13 0.0002	85.56±0.27 0.0035	85.78±0.32 0.0064	86.46±0.60 0.0008	85.72±0.23 0.0044
Diabetics 768×8	77.60±0.30 0.0126	77.30±0.41 0.0001	73.13±0.35 0.0040	76.98±0.32 0.0825	75.55±0.56 0.0008	75.93±0.52 0.0156
German 1,000×20	76.10±0.40 0.0453	75.55±0.28 0.0013	**68.54**±0.43 0.0055	76.21±0.36 0.0225	**69.75**±0.24 0.0012	75.80±0.32 0.0103
Hypothyroid 3,163×25	98.38±0.08 0.0536	97.50±0.03 0.0013	**76.56**±0.59 0.0065	98.21±0.09 12.7038	96.71±0.04 0.0045	97.28±0.01 0.0112
Pimaindian 768×8	77.99±0.34 0.0629	77.21±0.25 0.0001	73.07±0.67 0.0040	76.98±0.32 0.0921	76.05±0.44 0.0007	76.34±0.47 0.0107
Ring 7,400×20	77.20±0.10 7.2394	77.23±0.10 0.0021	76.37±0.16 0.0079	77.24±0.09 19.4349	77.24±0.06 0.0084	77.02±0.16 0.0136
TIC 5,822×85	93.97±0.00 2.8081	94.02±0.00 0.0091	**57.00**±1.23 0.0103	*	**78.21**±0.24 0.0278	93.25±0.24 0.0211
Titanic 2,201×3	77.60±0.00 0.0255	78.11±0.17 0.0002	76.98±1.01 0.0057	77.78±0.24 0.1111	77.68±0.04 0.0011	77.69±0.14 0.0055
Two 7,400×20	97.86±0.03 0.2219	97.82±0.04 0.0033	97.72±0.05 0.0081	*	97.83±0.02 0.0085	97.67±0.07 0.0097

*Out of Memory



Fig. 4. The influences of parameter tol on iteration, accuracy, and learning time on the benchmark datasets for nonlinear SGTSVM.

TABLE 3
The results on the benchmark datasets for nonlinear case.

Data m×n	CSVM Time (Sec.)	LSSVM Time (Sec.)	SGSVM Time (Sec.)	TBSVM Time (Sec.)	WLTSVM Time (Sec.)	SGTSVM Time (Sec.)
Australian 690×14	86.28±0.32 0.1770	87.10±0.26 0.0372	86.10±0.42 0.0144	87.10±0.43 0.2786	87.14±0.32 0.0903	85.21±0.16 0.0320
CMC 1,473×9	77.78±0.29 2.7363	78.05±0.28 0.2104	77.25±0.31 0.0495	77.14±0.53 0.9043	77.81±0.25 4.3916	77.75±0.11 0.1377
Creadit 690×15	86.05±0.27 0.2079	85.67±0.45 0.0351	86.28±0.41 0.0141	86.71±0.33 0.1780	86.30±0.68 0.1120	85.21±0.45 0.0304
German 1,000×20	75.70±0.75 0.8429	76.19±0.27 0.0854	74.22±0.92 0.0281	77.11±0.52 0.8935	76.14±0.64 0.2464	75.55±0.69 0.0736
Hypothyroid 3,163×25	98.21±0.06 0.1509	97.86±0.02 0.1089	97.28±0.16 0.0112	98.08±0.09 5.8786	97.46±0.16 6.1016	98.07±0.03 0.0253
Pimaindian 768×8	76.48±0.61 0.3243	77.17±0.59 0.0484	75.71±0.81 0.0167	77.73±0.25 0.2097	76.81±0.30 0.1171	75.72±0.29 0.0419
Ring 7,400×20	98.71±0.03 0.6827	98.57±0.03 0.2628	**75.51**±1.96 0.0153	*	*	98.27±0.04 0.1282
TIC 5,822×85	94.02±0.00 3.5700	94.03±0.02 0.2525	93.97±0.04 0.0139	*	*	94.01±0.01 0.1301
Titanic 2,201×3	77.73 ±0.00 0.4455	77.69±0.00 0.1174	77.49±0.33 0.0091	77.56±0.09 0.1768	78.97±0.16 1.6229	76.15±2.30 0.0220
Two 7,400×20	97.83±0.03 1.0422	97.81±0.02 0.2560	97.56±0.07 0.0152	*	*	97.54±0.07 0.1279

*Out of Memory

TABLE 4
The results on the large scale datasets.

Data	CSVM Validation Testing Time(Sec.) Memory	SGSVM Validation Testing Time(Sec.) Memory	SGTSVM Validation Testing Time(Sec.) Memory
CODRNA	90.76	90.51	95.38
59,535×8	91.78	91.10	95.19
271,618×8	0.8320	0.0518	0.1352
	9MB	<1MB	<1MB
SKIN	93.40	90.43	93.90
49,011×3	90.40	90.23	94.07
196,046×3	0.6180	0.0990	0.1417
	3MB	<1MB	<1MB
SUSY	76.64	70.11	76.60
1,000,000×18	78.28	70.86	78.32
5,000,000×18	13.8010	0.1500	0.2002
	330MB	<1MB	<1MB

[5] T. Lal, M. Schröder, T. Hinterberger, J. Weston, M. Bogdan, N. Birbaumer, and B. Schölkopf, "Support vector channel selection in BCI," *Data Mining and Knowledge Discovery*, vol. 51, no. 6, pp. 1003–1010, 2004.

[6] H. Ince and T. Trafalis, "Support vector machine for regression and applications to financial forecasting," in *International Joint Conference on Neural Networks*, Italy, 2002, pp. 6348–6354.

[7] Jayadeva, R. Khemchandani, and S. Chandra, "Twin support vector machines for pattern classification," *IEEE Trans.PatternAnal. Machine Intell*, vol. 29, no. 5, pp. 905–910, 2007.

[8] Y. Shao, C. Zhang, X. Wang, and N. Deng, "Improvements on twin support vector machines," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks*, vol. 22, no. 6, pp. 962 – 968, 2011.

[9] X. Peng, "TPMSVM: A novel twin parametric-margin support vector machine for pattern recognition," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 44, no. 10-11, pp. 2678–2692, 2011.

[10] Y. Shao, W. Chen, J. Zhang, Z. Wang, and N. Deng, "An efficient weighted lagrangian twin support vector machine for imbalanced data classification," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 47, no. 9, pp. 3158–3167, 2014.

[11] Y. Shao and N. Deng, "A coordinate descent margin based-twin support vector machine for classification," *Neural Networks*, vol. 25, pp. 114–121, 2012.

[12] Z. Wang, Y. Shao, and T. Wu, "A ga-based model selection for smooth twin parametric-margin support vector machine," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 46, no. 8, pp. 2267–2277, 2013.

[13] D. Li, Y. Tian, and H. Xu, "Deep twin support vector machine," in *Data Mining Workshop (ICDMW), 2014 IEEE International Conference on*. IEEE, 2014, pp. 65–73.

[14] Z. Wang, Y. Shao, L. Bai, and N. Deng, "Twin support vector machine for clustering," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, vol. 26, no. 10, pp. 2583–2588, 2015.

[15] W. Chen, Y. Shao, C. Li, and N. Deng, "Mltsvm: A novel twin support vector machine to multi-label learning," *Pattern Recognition*, vol. 52, pp. 61–74, 2015.

[16] M. Bazarra, H. Sherali, and C. Shetty, *Nonlinear Programming‖Theory and Algorithms, second ed.* Wiley, 2004.

[17] J. Platt, "Fast training of support vector machines using sequential minimal optimization," in *Advances in kernel methods-support vector learning*, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press, 1999, pp. 185–208.

[18] T. Joachims, "Making large-scale SVM learning practical," in *Advances in Kernel Methods-Support Vector Learning*, Cambridge, 1998, pp. 169–184.

[19] C. Chang and C. Lin, LIBSVM*: A library for support vector machines*, http://www.csie.ntu.edu.tw/~cjlin, 2001.

[20] R. Fan, K. Chang, C. Hsieh, X. Wang, and C. Lin, "LIBLINEAR: a library for large linear classification," *Journal of Machine Learning Research*, vol. 9, pp. 1871–1874, 2008.

[21] Y. Tian and Y. Ping, "Large-scale linear nonparallel support vector machine solver," *Neural Networks*, vol. 50, pp. 166–174, 2014.

[22] J. Kivinen, A. Smola, and R. Williamson, "Online learning with kernels," *Signal Processing, IEEE Transactions on*, vol. 52, no. 8, pp. 2165–2176, 2004.

[23] T. Zhang, "Solving large scale linear prediction problems using stochastic gradient descent algorithms," in *Proceedings of the twenty-first international conference on Machine learning*. ACM, 2004, p. 116.

[24] S. Shai, Y. Singer, N. Srebro, and A. Cotter, "Pegasos: Primal estimated sub-gradient solver for svm," *Mathematical programming*, vol. 127, no. 1, pp. 3–30, 2011.

[25] W. Xu, "Towards optimal one pass large scale learning with averaged stochastic gradient descent," *arXiv preprint arXiv:1107.2490*, 2011.

[26] A. Bennar and J. Monnez, "Almost sure convergence of a stochastic approximation process in a convex set," *International Journal of Applied Mathematics*, vol. 20, no. 5, pp. 713–722, 2007.

[27] O. Mangasarian and E. Wild, "Multisurface proximal support vector classification via generalize eigenvalues," *IEEE Trans.PatternAnal. Machine Intell*, vol. 28, no. 1, pp. 69–74, 2006.

[28] J. Bi and V. Vapnik, *Learning with rigorous support vector machines*. Springer, 2003.

[29] B. Schölkopf and A. Smola, *Learning with kernels*. Cambridge: MA:MIT Press, 2002.

[30] R. Khemchandani, Jayadeva, and S. Chandra, "Optimal kernel selection in twin support vector machines," *Optimization Letters*, vol. 3, pp. 77–88, 2009.

[31] Y. Lee and O. Mangasarian, "RSVM: Reduced support vector machines," in *First SIAM International Conference on Data Mining*, Chicago, IL, USA, 2001, pp. 5–7.

[32] Z. Wang, Y. Shao, and T. Wu, "Proximal parametric-margin support vector classifier and its applications," *Neural Computing and Applications*, vol. 24, no. 3-4, pp. 755–764, 2014.

[33] G. Golub and L. Van, *Matrix Computations*. The John Hopkins University Press, 1996.

[34] W. Rudin, *Principles of mathematical analysis*. McGraw-Hill New York, 1964, vol. 3.

[35] S. Kakade and A. Tewari, "On the generalization ability of online strongly convex programming algorithms," in *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 2009, pp. 801–808.

[36] J. Suykens and J. Vandewalle, "Least squares support vector machine classifiers," *Neural Process Letter*, vol. 9, no. 3, pp. 293–300, 1999.

[37] Matlab., *User's Guide, The MathWorks, Inc*, http://www.mathworks.com, 1994-2010.

[38] C. Blake and C. Merz, *UCI Repository for Machine Learning Databases*, http://www.ics.uci.edu/~mlearn/MLRepository.html, 1998.

[39] R. Duda, P. Hart, and D. Stork, *Pattern Classification, 2nd Edition*. John Wiley and Sons, 2001.